DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 544 UD 020 543

AUTHOR Knight, Michael E.
TITLE Evaluation of Title I Program, Community School District 31, New York City. 1978-79 School Year. Final Report, E.D.I. Reading Lab.
INSTITUTION Community School District 31, Staten Island, N.Y.
PUB DATE 19 Oct 79
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Reading Centers; *Reading Improvement; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York (Staten Island)

ABSTRACT

This program was designed to improve reading skills and to provide intensive remediation for students in grades six through nine. Specialized materials and equipment were provided by Educational Development Laboratories (EDL). The EDL Reading Laboratory utilized the Learning 100 program, a multi-modality developmental and remedial program. Small groups of students received instruction for no less than 40 minutes daily, five days a week. Constant feedback on individual and group progress was provided. Quantitative analysis of the program was based on a pretest/posttest design with the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test serving as the measuring instrument. In all cases the actual posttest mean surpassed the predicted posttest mean. The primary strengths of the program were seen to be the positive manner of the personnel involved, the high expectation level set for student performance, and the high degree of individualization achieved by program participants. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 2 9 1980

ED186544

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

1978-79
District: 31

Project Title: E.D.L. Reading Lab

Source of Funding: ESEA Title I Budget Code/Project No. 5095-91624

Prepared by: Dr, Michael E. Knight

"Official Copy of this Evaluation, Approved as Corrected by the Community School Board President and/or the Community Superintendent, District 31 on October 19 ,1979."

Louis DeSario
Community Superintendent #31

Angelo J. Aponte
Chairman C.S.B. #31

ED020543

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
NYC Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATION OF TITLE I PROGRAM
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 31, NEW YORK CITY
1978-79 SCHOOL YEAR

FINAL REPORT

E.D.L. READING LAB.
FUNCTION NUMBERS

50 95 91624
50 95 98732 (Impact Aid)

Prepared by: Dr. Michael E. Knight

I. INTRODUCTION

This program was designed to improve the reading skills of students in grades 6, 7, 8, and 9. This is the first priority established by the State Department of Education.

The two schools participating in the program were I.S. 61 and J.H.S. 49. Participants in the program were selected according to approved criteria. Specialized equipment and materials were provided by Educational Development Laboritories (EDL). The methodology included sequential procedures and repeated reinforcement measures designed to improve specific skill deficiencies. The program was staffed by a teacher and an educational assistant in each classroom.

Table I provides the distribution of participants by grade level.

TABLE I

Enrollment in the E.D.L. Reading Lab

Grade	Enrollment
6	34
7	120
8	122
9	30
TOTAL	305

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

The objectives of this program were to improve reading skills and to provide intensive remediation for the participants. The primary qualitative evaluation was provided through observation and the use of a rating

scale designed for this program. A sample of the rating scale is provided in Section IV.

The primary quantitative objective of this program was to demonstrate statistically significant differences between the actual posttest score and the predicted posttest score, using Correlated "t" Tests. The pretests were the pupil's Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Scores from October 1978. The posttest was the same test administered in May 1979.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Staffing

All positions allocated for this program were filled by appropriately qualified personnel, a teacher and an educational assistant in each classroom.

Activities

The E.D.L. Reading Laboratory (I.S. 61 and J.H.S. 49) utilized the Learning 100 Program, a multi-modality instructional program designed to meet the development and remedial needs of students. It allowed each pupil to enter the program at his own level. Learning 100 Program provided for constant feedback and appraisal of both individual and group progress. All instructional techniques were geared toward the development of sequential learning, the student progressed in small steps, thus the learning of one particular facet was mastered before the student progressed. Learning 100 involved the use of films, filmstrips, and recordings to give the student maximum enrichment.

A supportive corrective reading teacher provided instructional service

at I.S. 61. The instructional design provided specific and concentrated experiences for the development of crucial reading skills: Working with Sounds, Following Directions, Using the Context, Locating the Answer, Getting the Main Idea, Drawing Conclusions, and Detecting Sequence. The principal materials used were: The Barnell Loft, Ltd.; Specific Skill Series Materials; SRA Readers Digest Materials were also used to improve skills in learning word meanings from context, selecting main ideas, drawing inferences: choosing between fact and fiction, word study skills.

All pupils (in groups of 12-15 pupils) received instruction five days a week for no less than a 40 minute period per day. The total weekly time in minutes was not less than 200 minutes.

The program is multi-level in nature, allowing each student to enter at his own level. The program materials presuppose no previous ability on each particular reading skill introduced.

Learning 100 provided for constant feedback and appraisal of individual and group progress. Both teacher and student knew at all times what progress was being made. Individual weaknesses were recognized and special attention given in the form of reteaching activities.

The incorporation of a number of auto-instructional approaches allowed each student to progress at his own learning rate. He neither had to keep up with the rate of group progress, nor did he have to be slowed down because the remainder of his group could not learn as quickly as he did.

Materials used in the program included: audex projector 101, tachistoscope, Combo 8 controlled reader, table top screen, Flash X casette player and headsets. Individual pupil records were maintained at the participating

schools. There were individual folders for each pupil. Included were the following: pretest score and analysis; pupil progress chart indicating skills mastered/unmastered/taught/learned. The pupil's folder also recorded attendance.

Function of the E.D.L. Reading Lab Teacher

I.S. 61 was staffed with two teachers and two educational assistants. J.H.S. 49 was staffed with two teachers and two educational assistants. The sedond teacher and the second educational assistant at J.H.S. 49 were added with funds from Impact Aid. The teachers provided small group and individualized instruction. The professional staff was responsible for maintaining ongoing communication with each pupils' regular classroom teachers (written, oral or both). The teachers also were responsible for administering and recording pre-posttest data. The educational assistants under the supervision of the teacher provided individual instruction; assisted in the maintenance of records; assisted in the preparation of materials for use by the pupils.

Function of the School Principal

The principal of each school participating in this program had primary responsibility for the supervision, administration, and instructional details necessary for implementation of the program.

Staff Training

The staff who provided training in the E.D.L. Reading Lab, have received specialized training in the organization, implementation and management of the E.D.L. Program from Educational Developmental Lab personnel at McGraw Hill. All teachers in the program have been trained by E.D.L. staff.

Materials, Equipment and Facilities

The physical facilities in both schools were excellent.

Changes in the Program

There were no changes in the program other than the addition of students served.

Problems Involved in Program Implementation

There were no problems observed regarding the implementation of this program.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Process Evaluation

An observation rating scale was used by the evaluator to complete the qualitative evaluation. The results of these observations and the resulting ratings are presented in Table II. Each school was visited four times and the ratings were based on twenty observations.

Examination of Table II indicates outstanding implementation of this program. The overwhelming majority of the ratings, approximately 70% were in the "excellent" category. Inspection of the remaining ratings indicates that a minimal number of ratings were "fair" and there were no ratings below that category. When the "excellent" and "very good" categories are combined, these ratings account for over 95% of the values assigned during the observations. While the program was strong in all areas it was particularly strong in the following: individualization, appropriateness of learning activities, planning, positive learning environment, and record keeping. A

TABLE II

Rating of the E.D.L. Reading Lab

Number of Observations = 20	Distribution of ratings in %				
	5	4	3	2	1
1. Suitability of available materials/equipment direct instruction and independent activities.	75	25			
2. Availability of materials/equipment, direct instruction and independent activities.	80	20			
3. Sufficiency of materials/equipment, direct instruction and independent activities.	75	25			
4. Emphasis is on development of concepts and understanding.	60	40			
5. Experiences of children are drawn on.	50	50			
6. Nature of subject matter content suitable for children in this program.	65	35			
7. Concepts and learnings are related to other areas of the curriculum.	40	60			
8. Oral language and thinking are encouraged through questioning.	65	25	10		
9. Emotional climate	90	10			
10. Independent groups and individuals are supervised.	80	20			
11. Activities appear well planned and organized.	80	20			

TABLE II - continued

	Distribution of ratings in %				
	5	4	3	2	1
12. Provisions are made for follow-up to provide continuity.	85	15			
13. Attention given to individual children as well as to total group.	75	25			
14. Children participate actively in the lesson.	75	20	5		
15. A variety of grouping procedures are used.	70	20	10		
16. Independent activities are correlated with direct instruction in a particular skill area.	80	20			
17. Prescription is based on adequate diagnosis	60	25	15		
18. Educational Assistant is actively involved in the classroom.	90	10			
19. Record keeping is efficient and thorough.	65	35			
20. A variety of learning modalities and experiences are used.	75	25			
21. General rating or quality of activity observed.	70	30			

Scale: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Very Good; 3 = Fair; 2 = Poor; 1 = Very Poor

rating scale, such as the one used in this evaluation, would not indicate performance at such a high level unless the personnel involved in the program were exceptionally competent.

Students participating in the program made it clear that they understood the overall operation of the program, the record keeping they were required to perform, and the use of equipment and materials. Observations of the students at work left no doubt of their ability to function as independently as possible. The observations yielded evidence that the students possessed positive attitudes toward themselves and their eventual successful reading, their teachers and educational assistants, and the E.D.L. program.

Product Evaluation

The quantitative analysis of this program was based on a pretest/posttest design with the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test serving as the measuring instrument. Historical regression and Correlated "t" Tests were used to predict posttest scores based on the students' previous performance.

The results of the Correlated "t' Tests are presented in Table III. Also presented are: the number of participants by grade level; the pretest mean; the predicted posttest mean; and the actual posttest mean.

In all cases the actual posttest mean surpassed the predicted posttest mean and in ten of the twelve cases the differences were statistically significant. It seems clear from these data that the goals of this program have been achieved.

Program Strengths and Weaknesses

The primary strengths of the program were the positive manner of the

TABLE III

Mean Pretest and Posttest Scores on the
Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, and the Correlated "t" Test

Grade	N	Pretest Mean	Predicted Posttest	Posttest Mean	"t"
Regular Program - Auditory Vocabulary Subtest					
6	34	4.46	5.18	5.30	1.79
7	75	4.71	5.39	5.81	2.27*
8	90	5.56	6.33	6.79	2.63*
9	28	4.89	5.44	5.96	2.59*
Regular Program - Comprehension Subtest					
6	34	3.15	3.68	4.12	2.33*
7	75	4.02	4.59	5.07	2.46*
8	90	5.18	5.81	6.40	2.57*
9	28	5.47	5.99	6.46	2.29*
Impact Aid - Auditory Vocabulary Subtest					
7	42	4.12	4.71	4.81	1.56
8	27	4.50	4.97	5.53	2.45*
Impact Aid - Comprehension Subtest					
7	42	4.42	4.96	5.64	2.73*
8	27	4.86	5.34	5.70	2.31*

personnel involved, the high expectation level set for student perforamnce, and the high degree of individualization achieved by the participants in the program. The teachers and educational assistants developed excellent relationships with their students.

No weaknesses of any significance were observed.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are submitted for consideration by the Community School District.

1. The program should be recycled.
2. New equipment and materials should be purchased as needed. Purchase of new equipment developed by E.D.L. should be considered.
3. Meetings between schools regarding successful techniques.
4. Efforts should be made to improve articulation between E.D.L. teachers and classroom teachers.